

a slot formed therein for receiving a winding and/or a tie coupled to the lamination and binding ring to enable the winding to be held within the slot.

The Office Action alleges that Jäger discloses lamination 24 having slot 14 formed therein for receiving a winding. (See page 3, lines 1-2 of the Office Action.) Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of Jäger. While Jäger does indeed disclose a lamination 24, slot 14 is not formed therein. In particular, slot 14 is formed in pressure plate 10, not lamination 24. (See col. 3, lines 64-65 of Jäger.)

Moreover, not only is slot 14 not formed in lamination 24, slot 14 also does not receive a winding. Specifically, Jäger discloses support angle 11 (alleged in the Office Action to form the claimed "tie") being engaged in slot 14 rather than a winding. (See col. 3, lines 64-67 and Fig. 1 of Jäger.) Support angle 11 is not a winding, but rather a fiberglass-reinforced plastic. (See col. 4, lines 4-5 of Jäger.)

With respect to dependent claim 2, Applicant submits that Jäger further fails to disclose a tie being arranged around a portion of the lamination and a portion of the binding ring. This feature is supported by, for example, the exemplary embodiment directed to Figs. 1-3 of the application which illustrates a tie 50a or 50b around a portion of lamination 30a and a portion of binding ring 10a. In contrast, support angle 11 (assuming arguendo that support angle 11 even forms the claimed tie) does not extend around support ring 12 (see Figs. 1 and 2 of Jäger).

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Jäger fails to disclose each limitation required by claims 1, 2 and 7 and thus respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Jäger in view of Wielt et al (U.S. '867, hereinafter "Wielt"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, all of the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Jäger and Wielt fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. As discussed above, Applicant submits that Jäger fails to disclose forming a slot in a lamination to receive a winding and/or a tie which enables the winding to be held within the slot. Wielt fails to remedy these deficiencies of Jäger with respect to the claimed invention. Even if Wielt and Jäger were combined as proposed by the Office Action, the combination would not have taught or suggested all of the claimed limitations. Applicant thus requests that the rejection of claims 13 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Jäger and Wielt be withdrawn.

Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Jäger in view of Druss, deceased et al (U.S. '106, hereinafter "Druss"). Claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Jäger in view of Druss and further in view of Wielt. Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Jäger in view of Ross (U.S. '893). Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jäger in view of Ross and further in view of Wielt. Each of these secondary or tertiary references (i.e., Druss and Ross) fails to remedy the above described deficiencies of Jäger (alone) or in combination with Wielt. Even if Ross or Druss were combined with Jäger (alone) or with Jäger and Wielt, the combination would not have taught or suggested all of the claimed limitations.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejections of claims 3-6 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

New Claims:


New claims 24-38 have been added to provide additional protection for the invention. Independent claim 24 requires, inter alia, "a lamination coupled to at least a portion of an outer circumference of said binding ring, said lamination having a slot formed therein for receiving a winding, the slot being defined between a portion of the outer circumference of the binding ring and a portion of an inner perimeter of the lamination." Independent method claim 32 requires a similar feature. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 24-38 are allowable.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Raymond Y. Mah
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM/sl
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703)816-4000
Facsimile: (703)816-4100